



The Environmental Interchange

Newsletter of the National Association of Environmental Professionals - Transportation Working Group

**Volume 1, Number 2
Spring 2001**

Chairperson

Douglas Zang
Wilbur Smith Associates
135 College Street
PO Box 9412
New Haven, CT 06534
(203) 865-2191
dzang@wilbursmith.com

Contributing Authors:

Geoffrey L. Baillie
Baillie & Associates
7700 Pioneer Way, Suite 101
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
253-858-3951
gbaillie@msn.com

Joe Trnka
Howard R. Green Company
4250 Glass Road NE, PO Box 9009
Cedar Rapids, IA 52409-9009
(319) 395-7805

Stephanie Kaselonis
Wilbur Smith Associates
P.O. Box 92
Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 251-3013

Newsletter Editor
Nanci Y. Regnier
nanci_regnier@hotmail.com
303-619-2459

NAEP Web Site: www.naep.org

In this Issue...

Reinventing NEPA #2;
The Washington State Experience

TRB Tribal Transportation Issues
Committee

Mineta Brings Spirit of
Bipartisanship to Transportation

Cultural Resources Special Studies
– What You Need
for a NEPA Project

Helpful Hints and a Basic Refresher
for the 2000 Census

MESSAGE FROM THE TWG CHAIR

Douglas Zang, Wilbur Smith Associates

I was recently at a public meeting during the review period for my Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the New Britain – Hartford Busway. A layperson who had read the entire executive summary (!) struck up a conversation with me, fascinated by the discovery that we NEPA practitioners have to address such a universe of environmental concerns as part of an EIS. He was particularly intrigued when I pointed out the “boilerplate” issues, namely, “The Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of Man’s Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long Term Productivity” and “Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.” What a mouthful! He must have certainly thought that this was government run amok when I showed him those sections of the EIS.

I call these issues “boilerplate” issues, because I (and likely most of you) typically give them minimal effort and coverage in an EIS. You usually can derive text from a similar earlier effort. And these subjects seem so abstract, nebulous, and conceptual, compared to the specific impacts you can determine for wetland encroachment, or noise levels.

However, our country is grappling with these very issues right now, albeit at a national scale. Is the Bush Administration anti-environment for stating that they will not abide by the Kyoto Protocols for reducing greenhouse gases? Or are they simply being forthright about our country’s *de facto* treatment of the issue since 1992? Without getting drawn into the political debate, this issue is absolutely about the relationship between short term uses of our environment and long term productivity. The debate about using the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to alleviate our current demand for energy is another good example. And all resource extraction is about the “Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.”

As NEPA practitioners and transportation professionals, we need to look at the long-term implications of the projects we are evaluating. (Yes, we’re also supposed to address “Cumulative and Secondary Impacts”, and that is another area that often gets short shrift.) If there were a way to perhaps re-title “The Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of Man’s Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long Term Productivity” to something a little more comprehensible, it would go a long way to make it relevant to the general public and us.

On a totally unrelated matter, the 2001 NAEP Annual Conference is coming to Arlington VA on June 24th – 28th. The TWG is scheduled to meet on Tuesday June 26th from 4:30 – 5:30 PM. This is your annual opportunity to meet other transportation professionals and help direct the future of our group. I encourage you to come to the conference and join us.

REINVENTING NEPA; THE WASHINGTON STATE EXPERIENCE (2ND IN A 3 PART SERIES)

Written by Geoffrey L. Baillie, P.E. (President, Baillie & Associates, Inc.), Keith McGowan (Principal, McGowan Environmental) and Vicki Steigner (OR System Planning Engineer, WSDOT, Olympic Region)

BACKGROUND

In the first article in this series, we reviewed the three Reinventing NEPA Pilot projects in Washington State; SR 104 (25 miles), SR 20 (7 miles), and I-405 (30 miles) from their inception through the development of purpose and need statements. In this article, we compare and contrast the projects in terms of their development of alternatives, screening criteria, and screening.

INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA AND SCREENING

The Transportation Decision Making Process in use for all three projects requires that screening of alternatives (for selection of alternatives to be fully examined in the EIS) be performed in two stages, and that the development of the criteria for the first stage precede the development of alternatives. The initial screening stage is best described as a “fatal flaw” filter in which alternatives that obviously do not meet purpose and need are eliminated from further study.

For I-405, approximately 300 individual multi-modal project improvements were identified for consideration in the 250+ square mile study area. The first screening stage asked: (1) could the individual improvements make a reasonable contribution to satisfying the purpose and need; (2) were the concepts feasible; and (3) did they contain any significant impacts that could not reasonably be avoided or mitigated. This first stage screening was of marginal utility at the corridor level, and resulted in nearly all projects being advanced to stage two.

For SR 20, the fatal flaw screening criteria were: (1) does not reasonably meet the project purpose or any project need; (2) any alternative that could not reasonably be permitted by resource agencies; (3) any alternative that would require a Design Standard deviation that would not reasonably be approved by WSDOT/FHWA; and (4) adverse impacts to historic, cultural, or recreational uses (Sections 4(f) and 6(f), or Section 106) if there are feasible and prudent alternatives. The SR 20 fatal flaw screening eliminated considerably more alternatives than I-405, leaving seven major categories of alternatives for consideration in Stage 2. The SR 104 process for Stage 1 screening used similar criteria and resulted in 36 alternatives being carried forward for further consideration.

SECONDARY CRITERIA AND SCREENING

The second stage screening process was considerably more arduous than initial screening for all three projects. For I-405, the second stage screening was much more rigorous, and included a wide range of evaluation measures related to the natural and built environment, land use and transportation plans and policies, cost-effectiveness, and

transportation performance that tied directly to the Purpose and Need. Weighting of evaluation measures was not attempted due to the wide range of viewpoints and values represented by the Steering, Citizen, and Executive Committee members. The screening analyses yielded information both about the overall performance of each strategy as well as key components of the strategies that might be reconfigured into EIS alternatives. Although the analyses were rich with results, their effectiveness in differentiating among the strategies was limited by the evaluation measures themselves. These limitations, combined with the unique requirements of a corridor transportation study of this scale, led to a series of Committee requests for increasingly detailed data that often approached a project level of analysis.

Results for SR 20 were similar to I-405. Secondary screening criteria included: (1) transportation performance; (2) financial and economic performance; (3) social and economic impacts; (4) land use/economic development impacts; (5) natural environment impacts; and (6) vicinity (off-corridor) impacts. Again, the Steering Committee requests for evaluation often approached project level detail. SR 104 is using a unique approach to secondary screening that includes a watershed-based analysis that involves a holistic look at aquatic resources, traffic analysis, land use impacts, and initial design for the 36 alternatives (divided among five project segments) that survived initial screening. These measures are summarized as: (1) multimodal/transportation linkage; (2) safety; (3) efficient and economical; (4) scenic and natural beauty, historic and rural characteristics; (5) quality of life; and (6) natural environment.

ALTERNATIVES ADVANCED FOR DETAILED EVALUATION IN THE EIS

About ten months after adoption of the I-405 Purpose and Need Statement, and after more than 65 meetings with the public, local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and Committees, concurrence was achieved on four consolidated action alternatives: (1) HCT/TDM emphasis, with new HCT throughout the corridor and very limited added roadway capacity to minimize new impervious surface; (2) Mixed mode and HCT emphasis, with new HCT throughout the corridor, substantial transit improvements, and one added freeway lane in each direction; (3) Mixed mode emphasis, with new bus rapid transit, substantial transit improvements, two added freeway lanes, and added arterial capacity; and (4) General capacity emphasis, with one added freeway lane, a new four-lane expressway, added arterial capacity, and improved transit service.

The SR 20 pilot used a subcommittee to expedite the distilling of small, segmented sub-alternatives into the following action

alternatives: (1) TDM/TSM/ITS; (2) High Speed Thoroughway; (3) Boulevard; (4) Undivided arterial; (5) No net new paved or

Reinventing NEPA (continued from page 2)

impervious surfaces; and (5) Transit/HOV. Secondary screening for SR 20 is not expected to be completed until summer 2001. SR 104 developed 36 alternatives within the five designated project segments. Secondary screening for SR 104 is expected to be completed in April 2001.

COMPARISONS AND OBSERVATIONS

I-405 has made excellent progress as it is the furthest along of the pilots and was the last to begin the reinventing NEPA

process. This is due in very large part to the intensity of the program and the active involvement and motivation of the stakeholders. Despite holding steering committee meetings more often than the other pilots, SR 20 lags the other pilots. In recognition of this, the SR 20 steering committee has established a subcommittee to deal with details between committee meetings that has resulted in good progress. For all three pilots, the steering committees have developed secondary screening criteria that require analysis for screening that approaches project level detail. This adds time and expense to the early portions of the process that, hopefully will result in time and cost savings in later project stages.

GREAT NEWS! ***TRB TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES COMMITTEE***

Ronald Hall, Director - Tribal Technical Assistance Program

Hello Everyone:

I hope you are doing well. I am happy to inform you that the Transportation Research Board has taken action to approve the creation of a new committee called the Tribal Transportation Issues Committee. This culminates many years of dedicated effort from a number of individuals within TRB to include tribal issues in their various committee and subcommittee discussions and presentations. Montie Wade with the Texas Transportation Institute and Ken Cook, retired TRB staff, deserve much of the credit for their continued support for this effort.

Those of you who were with us for the October meeting in Albuquerque recall that Mr. Tex Hall, Chairman of the Three Affiliated Tribes, graciously invited us to the Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation in North Dakota to host our first meeting should the committee proposal be approved. I should also mention that this is my home and I am excited to bring this first committee event to this wonderful and out-of-the-way destination. Please mark your calendars for August 14, 15, and 16 to travel to New Town, North Dakota.

We will conduct the first meeting at the Four Bears Casino and Lodge. Call (800) 294-5454 for reservations. A block of rooms has been set aside under the Transportation Research Board. Rates are \$65 per night on the weekend, \$55 per night weekday, and \$40 per night government rate weekday. This first meeting will be focused on developing a strategic plan for the committee and a research agenda. The Shell Creek Celebration (pow wow) is held the weekend before we meet, August 10-12, and is right across the highway from the Lodge. This site is also right on the shores of Lake Sakakawea, a reservoir on the Missouri River and part of the Lewis and Clark Trail.

Also, please note that the 4th Annual National Tribal Road Conference will be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico October 30, 31, and November 1, 2001. We will be mailing additional information and brochures soon.

Ronald Hall, Director
Tribal Technical Assistance Program
Rockwell Hall, Room 321
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80524-1276
Toll Free: (800) 262-7623
Direct: (970) 491-8653 email: rhall@lamar.colostate.edu
website: <http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/TTAP/>

MINETA BRINGS SPIRIT OF BIPARTISANSHIP TO TRANSPORTATION

By Mark Murray, [National Journal](#) - February 15, 2001

These are hard times for Democrats. George W. Bush has moved into the White House, and Republicans narrowly control both the Senate and the House. But after Bush finished nominating his Cabinet, Democrats believed they had control of at least one part of Washington: the world of transportation. President Bush, fulfilling his intention to include at least one Democrat in his Cabinet, on Jan. 2 appointed Democrat Norman Y. Mineta—who most recently served as Clinton's Commerce Secretary—to head the Transportation Department. And Mineta is no "Boll Weevil" Democrat: He supports organized labor, the environment, and the virtues of mass transit.

Of course, how much power the liberal Mineta will actually wield is a subject of debate among transportation observers. During the news conference announcing his appointment, Mineta said he was eager to work for Bush, stressing that transportation is a bipartisan issue. "There are no Democratic or Republican highways, no such thing as Republican or Democratic traffic congestion, no such thing as Republican or Democratic aviation and highway safety," he said. But partisan squabbles have, in fact, been common in transportation matters. These include fights over affirmative action in awarding highway construction contracts, labor issues involving transportation unions, and environmental concerns in transportation planning. Will Mineta have a say on these contentious issues? Or will he have to toe the Bush Administration's line?

Some Democrats privately say that Mineta might have a lot more power than many observers think. Bush can't afford to fire him or ask him to resign, these Democrats say, because Mineta's the Administration's sole Democrat. But other people believe that the White House will be calling most of the shots on important transportation matters, just

as Clinton's White House and Office of Management and Budget did when Rodney E. Slater sat atop the Transportation Department.

"The Secretary of Transportation is somebody who goes out and beats the bushes for the Administration on a repeated basis," a former Capitol Hill aide said. Moreover, although Mineta will probably bring along some of his own people, the Bush team will most likely fill the majority of the department's political positions.

Eric K. Federling, a former Mineta staffer, acknowledges that working for the Bush Administration will compromise some of Mineta's core principles. But the staffer notes that Mineta took the job knowing this would happen. "Norm's reputation and credibility is incredibly well-known.... I think [he realizes] there's an opportunity to do some good work for the American people."

Roy Kienitz, executive director of the Surface Transportation Policy Project, a pro-mass-transit group, hopes that Mineta will motivate the Bush Administration to focus more on transportation alternatives. "[Mineta] was the best possible outcome, given the other names that were mentioned," he said. Despite the questions about how much power Mineta will have, most Democrats and Republicans have applauded his selection. For starters, they praise his prior work as a mayor, a Congressman who chaired what was then called the House Public Works and Transportation Committee, a lobbyist for aerospace giant Lockheed Martin Corp., and Commerce Secretary. Indeed, his experience on the Hill will undoubtedly help him work with Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, who chair Congress's transportation authorizing committees. (Yet it will be interesting to see how the liberal Mineta gets along with the conservative Young.)

"I think the most important thing he's going to bring is that he's a transportation guy," said David A. Fuscus, a former Republican staffer who worked at the Mineta-led Transportation Committee. "Right from the beginning, there's no learning curve for Norm Mineta." In addition, Sante Esposito, who served as Mineta's chief counsel at the Transportation Committee and is now a Washington lobbyist, says that Mineta has a passion for transportation. "He's very committed to transportation policy. That's always been his love." And retired Rep. Robert Roe, D-N.J., who preceded Mineta as chairman of the Transportation Committee, is impressed by Mineta's mind and attitude: "He's a visionary. He's gutsy.... I think he'll be a great guy at the helm of the department."

Mineta, however, has received some criticism for failing to work with his Republican counterparts at the committee—especially Rep. Bud Shuster, R-Pa.—after 1994, when the Democrats lost their majority in the House. Mineta, who was no longer chairman, left Congress in 1995 to work for Lockheed Martin. "Mineta and Shuster just did not get along," said one former Hill aide. "They were barely speaking to each other by the time Mineta left." Their feud might still create some tensions: Shuster's trusted aide, Jack Schenendorf, is heading Bush's transportation transition team and will play a key role in staffing the department.

When Mineta moves into the Secretary's suite, he will have his hands full of challenging transportation issues. Airline delays and gridlock plague the skies. The air traffic control system is antiquated. And Amtrak could be liquidated if it doesn't start meeting its operational costs. "They are really tough, tough jobs that he's going to have to tackle head-on," Fuscus said.

TWG MEMBER PROFILE

A Transportation Working Group (TWG) member is a member of the National Association of Environmental Professionals (NAEP) in good standing, who possesses an interest and desire to be more connected to other practitioners of environmental policies, regulations, and processes related to the transportation arena. The Environmental Interchange is published quarterly by the National Association of Environmental Professionals (NAEP) Transportation Working Group (TWG). To participate in future TWG activities, please contact Doug Zang of Wilbur Smith Associates at (203) 865-2191 or dzang@wilbursmith.com

CULTURAL RESOURCES SPECIAL STUDIES WHAT YOU NEED FOR A NEPA PROJECT

By Joe Trnka, Howard R. Green Company

Transportation projects almost always require some kind of cultural resources special study (CRSS) in order to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). A quality CRSS contains:

- A clearly defined area of potential effect (APE);
- Information on the cultural resources found within the APE;
- Significance statements for any historic properties found in the APE given in National Register of Historic Places criteria (note – this is not significance as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27); and,
- Determination of effects on historic properties in the APE.

The APE would appear to be your project footprint but this is not always the case. In some projects, especially rural highway realignments and new freeways through previously developed urban areas, the APE can be larger than your project footprint. You provide a clear description of your project footprint to begin the development of the CRSS and accept that your project APE may be different than that footprint due to the

nature of the resources found in the project area.

Information provided on the cultural resources found within the APE is usually thought to be archaeological and architectural information in nature.

It is important to remember; however, that the cultural resources found in your APE may range from a rural historic landscape to a traditional cultural property (TCP). A TCP may trigger an Environmental Justice issue if it is a traditional religious or traditional resource procurement area. Its loss, or even disrupted access to it, may disproportionately affect a minority community.

Section 301 [5] of the NHPA defines historic property as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure or object included in, or eligible for, inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such property.

However, a property can only be a "historic property" if it meets the eligibility criteria and retains integrity

of those features necessary to convey its significance.

The significance statements for historic property must be given in terms of the criteria published by the National Park Service in National Register Bulletin 15 "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

In order to be eligible, a property must have a historic context associated with at least one of four criteria:

- it must have a strong association with the broad patterns of local, regional, or national history;
- it is strongly associated with the life of a historically significant person;
- it exhibits historic architectural significance; or
- it has a strong potential to yield information important to further understanding the history of a region and its past inhabitants.

Remember that property less than 50 years old can be considered historic property – NPS Criteria Consideration G specifically addresses when recent properties qualify as historic properties.

Historic property does not have to be listed on the National Register in order to be protected by the NHPA. If a property is eligible for listing on the National Register, the NHPA requires that it must be treated as if it were already listed.

Finally, the CRSS must contain a determination of the effect your project would have on historic property within your APE. Without that, it is impossible to make a meaningful determination of the significance of impacts as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27, develop practicable mitigation options, or determine if a Section 4(f) Statement is required.

Providing a well-developed determination of effect also makes for better coordination with the appropriate State or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO or THPO) when it is time for them to comment on your project.

Front-end load your CRSS to address these four points and you minimize your cultural resources headaches. Fail to address these points in your CRSS and you guarantee delays, change orders, and additional costs to you and your client.

Helpful hints and a basic refresher for the 2000 Census

By: Stephanie Kaselonis, Wilbur Smith Associates, March 2001

The following is a brief discussion of the major changes and issues involving 2000 US Census data. The information below was gathered from the US Bureau of the Census and attendance at several training sessions involving Census updates. This is meant only as a helping tool.

GEOGRAPHIC CODING CHANGES

- All Census Block numbers are new.
- New Census Tracts were created in some rural areas.
- Census Designated Places (CDPs) may have been modified (be wary of CDP's. The population threshold was eliminated for CDP's any many now have new boundaries, or new CDP's exist that did not before.)

CENSUS BLOCKS

All Census Blocks will now have 4 digits as opposed to three with a possible A or B suffix. Unfortunately, at this time there is no conversion or compatibility file showing these changes. The best bet is to compare the 1990 and 2000 Census maps (this is a good idea when comparing Census geographic boundaries between any two Census dates).

There are no more Block Group Areas (BGA)/Block Numbering Areas (BNA) instead of Census Tracts. All counties now have Census Tract numbers. It may be difficult to compare BNA's and the newly formed Census Tracts due to their geographic boundaries.

CENSUS TRACTS

Many Census Tracts were split to reflect population growth. This is especially true for fast growing suburbs of large cities. The new Tracts may have the same base number as the original Tract and end in 01 or 02, or they may have *new numbers*. Some Tracts may also have changed shape or be combined with an adjoining Tract.

Again, always compare 2000 geography with geography from other Censuses.

A crew-of-vessel Tract contains the crews of military and commercial ships in port (or the home port of military ships) on Census day. Crew-of-vessel Tracts are coded with an adjacent regular Census Tract number with the suffix 99.

COUNTIES

Depending on the state, counties may be counties, parishes (like Louisiana/Alaska), and county equivalents.

COUNTY EQUIVALENTS

The following areas are treated equivalent to counties:

- Independent cities in
 1. Maryland
 2. Missouri
 3. Nevada
 4. Virginia
- A portion of Yellowstone National Park in Montana
- District of Columbia for the District
- Municipios in Puerto Rico
- Islands of the U.S. Virgin Islands
- Entities in the remaining small island areas

Be careful when working in the 4 states with independent cities. If you request county-level data – you get counties & independent cities – all which equal the total population. If you request place data- you only get the independent cities.

MORE DIFFICULTIES

In the New England States, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA's) are defined in terms of towns and cities rather than whole counties.

There are 21 states that have no legal county subdivision other than incorporated places. These Census County Divisions (CCDs) have no legal standing.

There are 21 states that have legal CCDs.

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. Alabama | 12. Nevada |
| 2. Arizona | 13. New Mexico |
| 3. California | 14. Oklahoma |
| 4. Colorado | 15. Oregon |
| 5. Delaware | 16. South Carolina |
| 6. Florida | 17. Tennessee |
| 7. Georgia | 18. Texas |
| 8. Hawaii | 19. Utah |
| 9. Idaho | 20. Washington |
| 10. Kentucky | 21. Wyoming |
| 11. Montana | |

The remaining states, except for Alaska, have Minor Civil Divisions (MCDs) below the county level, which are usually called townships (such as Ohio). Towns in New England are often treated as MCDs.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS AND ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGES

Indian Reservations are areas with boundaries established by treaty, statute, and executive or court order by the Federal and state governments, tribal governments, and courts. Treaties are signed by the President and ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Tribal governments have jurisdiction over their lands similar to county governments. The legal boundaries are identified by the Census Bureau, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and state governments. Reservations may cross state, county, county subdivision, and place boundaries. Trust lands are properties held in trust by the U.S. government outside of reservations for specific tribes.

In Alaska there are 12 Alaska Native Regional Corporations (ANRCs) which are corporate entities established by the Alaska Native Claims Act to conduct business and nonprofit activities for Alaska Natives. There are also Alaska Native Village statistical areas for bands, clans, villages, etc. that do not have legally recognized boundaries.

THE QUESTIONS OF THE 2000 CENSUS

There are two separate forms the Census uses- the short form and the long form. The long (or sample) form is given to only 17% of households. The rest fill out short forms.

SHORT FORM

The short form was reduced in size from 12 questions to 7 subjects because 5 subjects were moved to the long form.

This means that you can no longer get the following information at the Block level (however, you can still get it at the Block group level):

- Marital status
- Units in structure
- Number of rooms in unit
- Monthly rent
- Value of owner occupied housing.

The Seven Basic Questions:

There were seven basic questions on the Census form:

- Tenure (is a unit owned or rented)
- Name
- Sex

- Age
- Relationship to householder
- Hispanic origin
- Race

LONG FORM

The long form has been reduced from 57 to 53 questions. This includes the 7 short form questions. The other 46 questions are in the following categories:

- Social characteristics
- Economic characteristics
- Housing unit characteristics

Long Form Questions:

There are 27 more long form questions:

Population Questions:

- Marital status
- Place of birth, citizenship and year of entry
- School enrollment and educational attainment
- Ancestry
- Residence (5 years age)
- Language spoken at home

- Veteran status
- Disability
- Grandparents as caregivers
- Labor force status
- Place of work and journey to work
- Work status last year
- Industry, occupation and class of worker
- Income (previous year)
- Housing Questions
- Units in structure
- Number of rooms
- Number of bedrooms
- Plumbing and kitchen facilities
- Year structure built
- Year moved into unit
- House heating fuel
- Telephone
- Vehicles available
- Farm residence
- Value of home
- Monthly rent (including congregate housing)
- Shelter costs (selected monthly owner costs)

FYI

The person who fills out the form is very important because this person categorizes the ENTIRE HOUSEHOLD.

Example, if you have a married couple- husband black, wife white and the husband fills out the form- the whole household is considered black. If the wife fills out the form the whole household is considered white.

BE CAREFUL ABOUT
MAKING STATEMENTS
ABOUT HOUSEHOLDS
BECAUSE OF THIS.

DETAILS OF SOME SHORT FORM QUESTIONS

HISPANIC ORIGIN

The order of race and Hispanic origin was switched for the 2000 Census to avoid confusion for people filling out forms because many Hispanics filled in other for race (or wrote in Hispanic), then answered Hispanic origin to the next question.

RACE

There were many changes to the 2000 Census regarding race. You probably know that people could list more than one race for themselves on the 2000 Census.

It is important to remember that when looking for minority populations, any person who selected more than one race is considered a minority.

There were also changes to the race definitions:

1. The Asian and Pacific Islander was split into two groups
 - a. Asians
 - b. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders
2. The category American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut was changed to American Indian or Alaskan native.

DETAILS FOR SOME LONG FORM QUESTIONS

GRANDPARENTS AS CAREGIVERS

This is the only new question added to Census 2000.

INCOME

Median income- distribution of total number of units including those with no income by the total number of households.

Mean income- total income of universe by number of units in universe (total household income divided by total number of households). Per capita income- income computed for every man, woman, and child in a group. Divide total income of group by total population of the group.

TENURE

Renter occupied units include assisted living (continuous care) units.

33 Is this house, apartment, or mobile home —

- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household with a mortgage or loan?
- ☐ Owned by you or someone in this household free and clear (without a mortgage or loan)?
- ☐ Rented for cash rent?
- ☐ Occupied without payment of cash rent?

HOUSING

Single family detached = detached from any other house (even if have attached shed or garage) Single family attached- if dividing or firewall goes from ground to roof.

The Census 2000 added “boat, RV, van” for a category of housing units. This replaced “other” in the 1990 Census. Of note- “other” replaced “boat, tent, van, etc.” in the 1980 Census.

Because the wording of the Census was changed from “live and eat separately” to “live separately” for 2000, housing units are no longer required to have a kitchen. The new definition is more in line with United Nations definitions.

The 2000 Census may show more housing units in rural areas than 1990. An increase in units needs to be looked at carefully to see if it really happened, or occurred because of the definition change.

Another change was the 1990 rule that if there were more than 9 unrelated members of a household it was classified as a group quarters. These are now identified as households.

ADJUSTED VS. UNADJUSTED CENSUS DATA

Much has been said in the news the last few years concerning the use of statistical sampling for the 2000 Census.

In short, the Supreme Court agreed (at least in part) that adjusted data could not be used for apportioning Congressional seats, although the adjusted data could be used for redistricting.

The result- a two-number Census. There will be 2 full sets of data, one based on the raw count & one will be adjusted. But how do you compare 1990 & 2000 Census figures?

There are hypothetically 4 ways to compare 1990 & 2000 Census data:

1. 2000 adjusted & 1990 adjusted
2. 2000 adjusted & 1990 unadjusted
3. 2000 unadjusted & 1990 adjusted
4. 2000 unadjusted & 1990 unadjusted (however, this option makes little sense as it enhances the limitations of the 1990 adjusted data to correct for undercounting, but avoids similar data for 2000)

There are logistical pros and cons of using any of these data comparisons.

1. 2000 adjusted & 1990 adjusted- This compares “apples to apples” but only 1990 race/ethnicity data was adjusted. All other comparisons need to use the 1990 count (unadjusted). The adjustments also work better for larger geographic areas rather than smaller ones. Lastly, the adjustment of Census totals is not universally accepted.
2. 2000 adjusted & 1990 unadjusted- This ignores the 1990 undercount of minorities. However, it is the “official” version of both Census’. This does not change the numbers we all have been using for the 1990 Census in our reports.
3. 2000 unadjusted & 1990 adjusted- This also ignores the 1990 undercount of minorities. This comparison also has geographic bias. It is less accurate in cities,

Southwest, and rural areas due to undercounts. However, it is the only comparison that does not have statistical sampling involved.

4. 2000 unadjusted & 1990 unadjusted (however, this option makes little sense as it enhances the limitations of the 1990 adjusted data to correct for undercounting, but avoids similar data for 2000)

The “official” 1990 Census data is the unadjusted “count” data. At this time the Census Bureau “official” 2000 Census data is the adjusted count. The determination as to the proper way to compare 1990 & 2000 Census data has not been announced yet (verified by the US Census 2/27/01) however, a determination will be made within the next 2 – 4 months. However, it is important to remember this when you start using the 2000 data to find out and use the preferred data comparisons for your demographic analysis.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT!

Make your reservations for The NAEP 26th Annual Conference Environmental Policy & Process: New Directions or Staying on Course? Arlington, Virginia - June 24-28, 2001

This is your chance to meet and talk to the policy and decision-makers who are helping set new policy and are making regulatory decisions that shape environmental stewardship and affect our profession and businesses. Invited guests include Senators and Congressmen, State Legislators, and the key leaders within the Departments of Energy, Defense, Interior, Agriculture and others. You will want to participate in this important opportunity to meet and visit with our elected and appointed officials who will implement the new vision of environmental stewardship for our country.

NAEP's annual conference includes a full schedule of tracks, panel discussions, and Hot Topic lunches. Not to mention the National Environmental Excellence Awards, the President's Reception for Legislators and New Directorates, a full day of workshops and a dinner/cruise on board the Odyssey. We have 45 different sessions divided into 11 different tracks. Eleven of these sessions are panel discussions and five are Hot Topic lunches. There is something of interest for everyone.

Please join us for the first of several great D.C. Social Events of NAEP's 2001 National Conference, on Monday evening, June 25th at the President's Reception for Legislators and New Directorates. It will be held in the beautiful top floor skyroom in the DoubleTree Hotel, planned for your interaction with Legislators and Directors of various Federal Agencies.

Panel Discussions:

Lessons Learned from other Federal Agencies on
Resource Planning
NEPA Legal Issues
NEPA Roundtable Discussion
Pitfalls in Public Participation and How to
Resolve Issues that Arise
How to Increase the Effectiveness of Public
Participation
Watershed Management
Sustainable Agriculture vs. Smart Growth
NAEP Cod of Ethics – Analysis, Revision, and
Application
Adaptive Management
Professional Ethics
The Science Behind Sustainable Forestry

Training Courses:

NEPA for Managers & New Practitioners
NEPA Legal Issues
NEPA Advanced Cumulative Impact
Analyses
Mitigation Under NEPA: Theory and
Practice
Introduction to ISO 14000
Sustainable Indicators: Practical Application
for Communities, Government, and
Business
How to Become a Certified Environmental
Professional
8 Hour Hazwopper Refresher Course

Tracks:

NEPA
Environmental Policy in DOD
Land and Watershed Management
Ethics
EMS/Science & Technology
Regulations Practice
Public Participation
Utilities
Transportation
Sustainable Development
Training & Higher Education

For the most current information and details on the conference, registration forms, and sponsor and exhibitor information, check our web site at www.naep.org. For other questions call Donna Carter at 863-679-3852 or 877-679-3913.



**National Association of Environmental Professionals
Transportation Working Group
P.O. Box 2086
Bowie, MD 20718**